

**DOCUMENT RESUME**

ED 331 548

JC 910 221

**AUTHOR** Honeyman, David; And Others  
**TITLE** Community College Financing 1990: Challenges for a New Decade.  
**INSTITUTION** American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.; Florida Univ., Gainesville. Inst. of Higher Education.  
**REPORT NO** ISBN-0-87117-228-3  
**PUB DATE** 91  
**NOTE** 61p.; For the previous document in this series, see ED 292 533.  
**AVAILABLE FROM** American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 410, Washington, DC 20036 (\$18.00; \$15.00, AACJC members).  
**PUB TYPE** Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)  
**EDRS PRICE** MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.  
**DESCRIPTORS** Administrative Problems; \*Budgeting; Budgets; \*Community Colleges; Comparative Analysis; Costs; \*Educational Finance; \*Educational Trends; Enrollment; Federal Aid; Fees; \*Financial Policy; \*Financial Support; National Surveys; Public Colleges; State Aid; State Standards; Statewide Planning; Statistical Analysis; Student Financial Aid; Tables (Data); Tuition; Two Year Colleges

**ABSTRACT**

Drawing from a national survey of state-level community college financial policies and procedures, this report reviews trends in financial support, community college expenditures, tuition, and financial aid. Introductory material examines the relationship among enrollment, tuition, and financial aid. Based on data from 37 states, part I focuses on community college funding indicating an increase in overall levels of support. Data are provided on sources of operating funds by percentage of total funds available, state appropriations for all education, sources of state funds for general operating expenditures; funds allocated on the basis of program costs; reported changes in support mechanisms since fiscal year 1986; sources of funding for non-credit programs; funding for operations by means other than enrollment calculations; percentage of total state funds in support of categorical programs; sources of funds for capital outlay; and sources of local tax revenue in support of community colleges. Part II contains data on mean expenditures per full-time equivalent (FTE) student, including comparable data for 1985. This section also provides information on full-time and part-time headcount enrollments, as well as annual FTE student enrollment figures. States are listed in rank order by expenditure per FTE. Part III offers additional information on the financial support of community colleges, pointing to tuition and fee increases by state and changes in student financial aid. This section concludes with survey responses regarding the most critical problems facing community colleges. The questionnaire and a list of respondents are included. (JMC)

ED331548

# COMMUNITY COLLEGE FINANCING 1990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve  
reproduction quality.

• Views, opinions, or positions stated or  
implied do not necessarily represent those of  
ERIC or the Department of Education.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY  
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Gollattscheck

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

## CHALLENGES FOR A NEW DECADE

By David Honeyman, Mary Lynn Williamson, and James L. Wallenberger

# **COMMUNITY COLLEGE FINANCING 1990:**

## **CHALLENGES FOR A NEW DECADE**

**David Honeyman  
Mary Lynn Williamson, and  
James L. Wattenbarger  
American Association of  
Community and Junior Colleges**

© Copyright 1991 by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges  
Printed in the U.S.A.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without written permission from the publisher.

Published by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges  
National Center for Higher Education  
One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 410  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Phone: (202) 728-0200

ISBN 0-87117-228-3

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| List of Tables .....   | v   |
| Preface .....  | vii |
| Introduction .....   | 1   |
| Part I        Funding the Community College .....  | 5   |
| Part II       Expenditures for the Community College .....                                   | 35  |
| Part III      Additional Information on the Financial Support<br>of Community Colleges ..... | 41  |
| References .....   | 49  |
| Previous Reports in the Series .....   | 51  |
| Appendix A   The Questionnaire .....   | 53  |
| Appendix B   State-Level Respondents .....   | 57  |
| About the Editors .....  | 59  |

# LIST OF TABLES

|          |  |    |
|----------|--|----|
| Table 1  | States for Which No Data Were Reported . . . . .   | 4  |
| Table 2  | Sources of Operating Funds by Percentage of Total<br>Funds Available—1988 . . . . .                          | 7  |
| Table 3  | Summary of Sources of Operating Funds by Percentage<br>of All Funds Available—1988 . . . . .                 | 8  |
| Table 4  | Correlational Analysis for Sources of Funds by<br>Percentage Compared with Total Dollars Available . . . . . | 9  |
| Table 5  | State Appropriations for All Education—1988/89 . . . . .   | 12 |
| Table 6  | Sources of State Funds for General Operating<br>Expenditures . . . . .                                       | 16 |
| Table 7  | Funds Allocated on the Basis of Program Costs . . . . .  | 18 |
| Table 8  | States with Reported Changes in Support Mechanisms<br>Since FY 1986 . . . . .                                | 20 |
| Table 9  | Sources of Funding for Non-Credit Courses . . . . .  | 22 |
| Table 10 | Funding for Operations by Other than Enrollment<br>Calculations . . . . .                                    | 26 |
| Table 11 | Percentage of Total State Funds in Support of<br>Categorical Programs . . . . .                              | 28 |
| Table 12 | Sources of Funds for Capital Outlay—1988 . . . . .   | 30 |
| Table 13 | Sources of Local Tax Revenue in Support of<br>Community Colleges . . . . .                                   | 32 |
| Table 14 | Expenditures for Credit Programs—1988 . . . . .  | 36 |
| Table 15 | Expenditures per FTE, FTE, and Percent Change—1988<br>and 1985, and Rank by Expenditure—1988 . . . . .       | 38 |
| Table 16 | Tuition and Fee Increases (As Percentages)<br>Since 1985 . . . . .   | 42 |
| Table 17 | Percentage Changes in Sources of Financial Aid<br>Since 1985 . . . . .                                       | 44 |
| Table 18 | Critical Problems Reported by Respondents . . . . .  | 46 |

## PREFACE

**T**his is the eleventh in a series of publications related to financing public community colleges. The National Council of State Directors of Community/Junior Colleges, an affiliate council of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), has provided encouragement as well as support to the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Florida to continue these reports. The last volume of the series, *Financing Community Colleges 1988*, is available from AACJC, and readers may want it as well as this one in order to compare the changes that have occurred.

The 1988 report suggested that the changes in the various states required a new descriptive taxonomy to analyze the ways in which they allocated funds to their community colleges. Eight more states have begun using formula-based funding mechanisms, demonstrating that the new taxonomy is viable and useful.

An interesting observation can be made on the issues surrounding the financing of community colleges. Based upon personal experience as well as communication with many colleagues throughout the United States, we learned that those involved in the legislative process increasingly make decisions regarding the financing of the community college that contradict the philosophical basis of the community college. Such decisions hamper colleges from accomplishing their traditional mission. Several of these issues are discussed in this 1990 volume.

We thank those who contributed most of the work in preparing this report, the principal authors David Honeyman and Mary Lynn Williamson. We wish to express our appreciation to them and to all others who contributed data. We are also indebted to Christina Aslan for monitoring the details of manuscript preparation.

To the scholars and others who use this report, we request that you send us any comments or suggestions for improving the series' twelfth volume, which is currently being developed.

James L. Wattenbarger, Distinguished  
Service Professor and Director  
Institute of Higher Education  
College of Education  
University of Florida  
Gainesville, FL 32611

December 1990

## INTRODUCTION

**A**s public community, technical, and junior colleges became an integral part of the total American education system, the pattern of financial support for them became similar to that for other levels of education in each state's total financial support pattern. Being between the university and the K-12 public school system makes it difficult to categorize community, junior, and technical colleges separately. Difficulties in allocating state resources to education affect all levels in a similar manner. When one level of education suffers from inadequate support, all levels similarly suffer.

Past studies have developed taxonomies that purport to describe categories of support methodologies. Community college leaders seek to identify ways to enhance support by manipulating formulas, establishing categorical support patterns, capturing some advantage of the moment, or increasing appropriations overall. This study provides a comparison of how educators in different states use these methods to strengthen financial support for their colleges.

However, a broader view may be essential if an adequate level of support is to be attained. Perhaps community colleges now need to develop a cooperative approach to education funding that recognizes the partnership of all of those who serve the needs of students.

This has not always been the case. Previous studies indicate that for a number of years in various states community colleges were provided special attention by legislatures and local jurisdictional units. This special attention resulted in treatment that sometimes provided more funds for the community college than were made available to other levels of education. In other instances, the opposite situation existed. During the early days of community college development, when local funds were the predominant source of support, the competition for funds was at the local district level, between public schools and the community college. In a few states, community colleges were started as complete state-level operations, and in those states the dominance of the universities over financial support was apparent.

In fact, community colleges were often started during periods of rapid growth in the college-age population as a less expensive, alternate method to educate freshman and sophomore students. In some instances community colleges were treated with special concern during these initial stages. But however special the original mandates may have been, the procedures eventually supported the K-12 and university sectors at the expense of community colleges. Only recently has this changed.

As the decade of the 1990s begins, the separation of support for various educational levels is not as clearly defined as it has been in previous years, and community colleges have become a recognized part of a total system. This new status is not necessarily a positive development. The traditional acceptance of charging student fees, or use taxes, in the four-year institutions has become an accepted procedure in the community colleges and is becoming an increasing source of revenue.

Because of the new, holistic view of the educational system and the economic distress faced in almost every state, all levels of education are receiving an inadequate level of public support. The problems previously associated with local- and state-level favoritism for one level over another have apparently declined. Competition for scarce resources may no longer be in the best interest of the community college; cooperation and the use of effective total educational leverage may be the most effective strategy for the future.

### **Enrollment, Tuition, and Financial Aid**

The question of the relationship among enrollment, tuition, and financial aid as applied to the community college setting was one of the research areas for this study. It has long been held that there is an inverse relationship between tuition and enrollment. Recent studies have indicated that subtle shifts in the cost of education can result in a downward pressure on enrollment (Leslie and Brinkman, 1988) and that the uncertainties of financial aid make pricing decisions concerning tuition levels difficult (Yanikoski, 1986).

Community colleges are low-cost institutions when compared to public and private four-year programs. The competitive nature of funding public community colleges mentioned above creates a dual pricing system in most states: the high-priced four-year program and the low-priced two-year system. The rationale for such a system rests on four assumptions that have been noted by Yanikoski (1986):

- The social benefits of higher education deserve the support from the public tax base
- Low tuition encourages a diversity of students from all socioeconomic strata to try higher education
- Direct state support is more stable than financial aid as a source of predictable revenue
- Low tuition is easier to defend than inflation-driven increases in institutional scholarship funds (p. 116)

Given the economic changes that occurred between the period of this study and the previous one in the series, from 1985 to 1988, it was expected that relationships similar to those described above would be in evidence, i.e., increases in tuition and decreases in financial aid would

relate to decreases in enrollment. However, this was not the case. Percentage changes in enrollment were positively correlated with percentage changes in tuition and inversely related to percentage changes in financial aid for the period. These correlations were developed from the data on Tables 14 and 15 and are presented in Figure 1.

Increases in tuition at the district, in-state, and out-of-state levels (positively correlated with enrollment) did not appear to exert downward pressure on enrollment as expected. Likewise, the decreases in all levels of financial aid, particularly aid granted by the institution (negatively correlated with enrollment,  $r = -.82$ ), did not relate to decreases in enrollment.

While it is important to note that these data are not complete, it is reasonable to conclude that enrollment in community colleges has not been directly related to tuition during this time. Subtle changes in tuition may well continue to be acceptable to students irrespective of financial aid. It is probable that there is a marginal level to which tuition may rise with no contrary effect on enrollment and that the effect of financial aid on enrollment is not evidenced until that marginal level is reached.

This is probably the most important conclusion of this report. Currently it appears that community colleges can raise tuition without affecting enrollment. However, as the relative contributions to revenue for operations of community colleges continue to shift away from federal and state support, and as local sources and increases in tuition and student fees adjust for such losses and contribute more directly to total revenue, there will be a point where enrollment will begin to decline. The effects of such a model on the factors that influence enrollment need to be continually assessed for each state, and additional study on the effects of pricing decisions on students from various socio-economic levels is needed if the mission of the community college is to remain intact for the future.

**FIGURE 1**  
CORRELATION ANALYSES BETWEEN ENROLLMENT CHANGES AND  
TUITION AND FINANCIAL AID CHANGES 1988 AND 1985

|                             | Covariance: | Correlation: | R-squared: |
|-----------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|
| In-District Tuition         | 2.77        | .31          | .09        |
| In-State Tuition            | 30.72       | .47          | .22        |
| Out-of-State Tuition        | 257.19      | .29          | .09        |
| Federal Financial Aid       | -.78        | -.27         | .07        |
| State Financial Aid         | -.24        | -.16         | .03        |
| Private Financial Aid       | -.61        | -.25         | .06        |
| Institutional Financial Aid | -.01        | -.82         | .67        |

## Results of the Questionnaire

In order to gather information concerning the financial issues affecting community colleges, a questionnaire and explanatory cover letter were sent to each state's director of community colleges (See Appendices A and B). Thirteen states did not furnish the requested information. Those states are listed in Table 1. The community college enrollment of the 13 states not participating in this study represents 7.7 percent of the total U.S. enrollment as reported by AACJC (1988). South Dakota has no public community colleges, and thus is not included in this report.

Summary statistics, indicating non-participants and non-respondents, are indicated at the end of each table. Percentage calculations were based only on participating states who responded to that particular item on the questionnaire, and descriptive statistics are included where appropriate. Comparisons are made to the results of a previous survey that reported 1985-86 data (Wattenbarger, 1988).

**TABLE 1**  
**STATES FOR WHICH NO DATA WERE REPORTED**

| State   | Enrollment<br>1987-1988 |
|---|-------------------------|
| ALASKA  | 522                     |
| COLORADO  | 53,877                  |
| DELAWARE  | 8,191                   |
| IDAHO   | 5,441                   |
| KANSAS  | 50,105                  |
| MAINE   | 10,917                  |
| MISSOURI  | 60,828                  |
| MONTANA   | 3,354                   |
| NEBRASKA  | 29,183                  |
| NORTH DAKOTA  | 6,461                   |
| OHIO  | 150,073                 |
| SOUTH DAKOTA  | 0                       |
| UTAH  | 22,350                  |
| Total enrollment for states that did not report     | 401,302                 |
| Total for the 50 states                             | 4,922,291               |
| Percent of students for whom no data were available | 8.15%                   |

Enrollment data taken from the *1988 Statistical Yearbook of Community, Technical, and Junior Colleges*, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, p. 56.

# PART I

## FUNDING THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

**P**art I of this report indicates that while overall levels of support have increased since the 1988 study, state support for the operation of community colleges in the United States decreased in a number of states. Further, this decrease in the level of state support was accompanied by an increase in the level that student fees contributed to total operating revenue. In some states, colleges managed to replace declining state funds with increased local support. In fact, most of the areas in which local support increased were in states that had reduced their support.

The results in this report also indicated several new relationships between funding sources and total revenue available to the community college. Of particular interest were the negative relationships found between total revenue available to the community college and the portion of revenue received from both student fees and state sources. States that reported high percentages in the use of fees or high levels of state support did not report high levels of total support. An increased reliance on the student fees and state sources did not result in an increase in total available funds. It is important to note that the relationship between total revenue and revenue sources is a complex issue. These results can be interpreted as giving an indication of the strength and direction of such relationships.

Since the 1988 report, there has been a sevenfold increase in the number of states--from two, or 5.5 percent of the respondents, to 15, or 39.5 percent--that use lottery funds to support community college operations. While there remains a dependence on the sales and income tax mechanisms for the generation of state revenue, the use of excise taxes (on cigarettes, alcohol, etc.) and the lottery are increasing. Studies currently underway at the University of Florida are investigating the substitutive effect of lottery funds on the level of support for public schools in that state. Preliminary findings suggest that lottery proceeds are being used to substitute for general fund appropriations and are not providing the level of additional support to education originally expected. The effect of this substitution needs to be investigated at the community college level as well.

States are split concerning the use of program costs as a means for determining state allocations for community college support. Likewise, there is no identifiable change in the use of enrollment-driven formulas to determine levels of support. However, eight states reported that they have changed to a formula-based allocation scheme since the 1988 report. Categorical funds continue to be used to support equipment purchases and some special program offerings, including literacy, industrial

training, and social welfare training programs. While 58 percent of the respondents indicated that they receive property tax revenue in support of operations, 38 percent receive no income from local taxes, whether they be property, excise, or other taxes, and no state has reported instituting specific local taxes slated for community college use. Such a finding would have substantiated the belief of the authors that the property tax mechanism is already overburdened as the basic local fiscal support mechanism for education.

In general, there is a continuation of the trend away from state assistance for non-credit, recreation/leisure courses. Although the percentages in all categories have decreased since 1985-86, the overall trend continues to indicate a student fee basis for supporting non credit programs. As reported, state funds support certificate programs in 11 states, life-long learning programs in eight states, recreation/leisure programs in four states, and job training programs in six states.

The percentage of each state's general operating and unrestricted funds derived from state, local, student fees, federal, and other funding sources, are listed in Table 2. The table also shows the total dollar amount of each state's general operating fund for community colleges.

Twenty states indicated that they were currently deriving a lower percentage of operating funds from state sources than in 1985-86. New Mexico leads this group, reporting 55 percent of operating funds as being derived from the state, as compared to 77 percent in the earlier study. Only seven states reported receiving a higher percentage of funds from state sources. Note that categories identified with a "+" in Table 2 logged a higher percentage in 1988-89 than 1985-86, while those categories identified with a "-" saw a decreased percentage.

Regarding the percentage of funds derived from student fees, the report indicates that a reduction in state sources of revenue was accompanied by an increase in the percentage contribution of student fees. Of the 20 states reporting a decrease in the percentage of state funds, 15 indicated an increase in the use of student fees to generate revenue, and nine reported an increase in local support. Twelve states in all reported an increased percentage of funds from local sources, while four states reported a decreased percentage. All states had an increase in total operating funds and total available funds.

Table 3 provides a summary of the data in Table 2, including average percentages, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum values. Of the 37 states responding, the average percentage of funds drawn from state support is 58.16 percent. State funds, ranging from Hawaii's 100 percent to Wisconsin's 25 percent, are still the primary funding source for most community college systems. Local sources (taxes, required tuition payments by local agencies such as public school districts, etc.) and student fees accounted for 12.93 percent and 21.67 percent respectively. Federal sources (2.7 percent) and other sources (4.23 percent), which included gifts, endowment revenue, grants, etc., were the lowest reported sources.

**TABLE 2**  
**SOURCES OF OPERATING FUNDS**  
**BY PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE—1988**

| State           | State % | Local % | Student Fees % | Federal % | Other % | Total Funds \$ |
|-----------------|---------|---------|----------------|-----------|---------|----------------|
| Alabama         | 60 +    | 1.00    | 16 +           | 17 +      | 6 -     | 221,500        |
| Alaska*         |         |         |                |           |         |                |
| Arizona         | 26.80   | 51.50   | 13.10          | 0.00      | 8.60    | 224,687,188    |
| Arkansas        | 76.07 - | 0.00    | 21.51 +        | 0.94 -    | 1.48 -  | 28,324,948     |
| California      | 60 -    | 31 +    | 4 -            | 0.00      | 5 +     | 1,924,300,821  |
| Colorado*       |         |         |                |           |         |                |
| Connecticut     | 69.8 +  | 0.00    | 23.7 +         | 4.5 -     | 1.9 +   | 75,752,231     |
| Delaware*       |         |         |                |           |         |                |
| Florida         | 75 +    | 0.15 +  | 21.86 -        | 0.16 -    | 2.83 -  | 590,261,746    |
| Georgia         | 75 -    | 0.00    | 24 +           | 0.00      | 1.00    | 91,611,836     |
| Hawaii          | 100.00  | 0.00    | 0.00           | 0.00      | 0.00    |                |
| Idaho*          |         |         |                |           |         |                |
| Illinois        | 30 -    | 41.7 +  | 23.4 +         | 0.2 -     | 4.7 -   | 617,403,258    |
| Indiana         | 66 +    | 0.00    | 34 -           | 0.00      | 0.00    | 90,546,878     |
| Iowa            | 49.16   | 10.25 - | 22.78 -        | 5.61 +    | 5.18 +  | 155,518,990    |
| Kansas*         |         |         |                |           |         |                |
| Kentucky        | 71.21 - | 0.00    | 27.79 +        | 0.00      | 1 +     | 5,809,000      |
| Louisiana       | 70.21 + | 0.00    | 29.46 -        | 0.09 -    | 0.24 +  | 32,218,879     |
| Maine*          |         |         |                |           |         |                |
| Maryland        | 37 -    | 36 +    | 25 -           | 2 +       | 0.00    | 264,701,649    |
| Massachusetts   | 69.30   | 0.00    | 24.70          | 4.70      | 1.30    | 180,241,000    |
| Michigan        | 40.00   | 26 +    | 28 -           | 5.4 +     | 0.00    | 475,737,176    |
| Minnesota       | 61.90   | 0.00    | 37.85 -        | 0.25 +    | 0.00    |                |
| Mississippi     | 42.5 -  | 14.6 -  | 19.7 +         | 6.3 -     | 13.6 -  | 133,686,359    |
| Missouri*       |         |         |                |           |         |                |
| Montana*        |         |         |                |           |         |                |
| Nebraska*       |         |         |                |           |         |                |
| Nevada          | 85 +    | 0.00    | 14 -           | 0.00      | 1 -     | 35,026,071     |
| New Hampshire   | 63.00   | 0.00    | 27.00          | 6.00      | 0.33    | 24,701,594     |
| New Jersey      | 28 -    | 34 +    | 29 +           | 0.00      | 8.00    | 30,046,800     |
| New Mexico      | 54.9 -  | 30.8 +  | 12.2 +         | 0.5 -     | 1.6 -   | 42,000,000     |
| New York (SUNY) | 33.20   | 32.6 +  | 27.4 -         | 1.4 -     | 5.4 +   | 617,585,393    |
| North Carolina  | 76.4 -  | 11.6 +  | 7 +            | 3.5 +     | 1.5 +   | 427,156,429    |
| North Dakota*   |         |         |                |           |         |                |
| Ohio*           |         |         |                |           |         |                |
| Oklahoma        |         |         |                |           |         | 92,294,036     |
| Oregon          | 30.36 - | 47.96 - | 17.49 +        | 4.19 +    | 0.00    | 200,925,586    |

TABLE 2—Continued

| State                        | State % | Local % | Student Fees % | Federal % | Other % | Total Funds \$ |
|------------------------------|---------|---------|----------------|-----------|---------|----------------|
| Pennsylvania                 | 36.6 -  | 25.9 +  | 37.3 +         | 0.2 -     | 0.00    | 223,283,839    |
| Rhode Island                 | 62.5 -  | 0.00    | 19.4 -         | 1.2 +     | 14.3 +  | 39,746,549     |
| South Carolina               | 58.8 -  | 10.3 +  | 20.1 +         | 1 +       | 9.8 +   | 127,800,435    |
| South Dakota*                |         |         |                |           |         |                |
| Tennessee                    | 70 -    | 0.00    | 0.00           | 0.00      | 30 +    |                |
| Texas                        | 50 -    | 22 +    | 16 +           | 7 +       | 5 -     | 838,711,483    |
| Utah*                        |         |         |                |           |         |                |
| Vermont                      | 35.00   | 0.00    | 56.00          | 0.00      | 9.00    | 3,728,111      |
| Virginia                     | 77 +    | 0.00    | 22 +           | 1 -       | 0.00    | 217,000,000    |
| Washington                   | 82 -    | 0.00    | 15.40          | 2.6 +     | 0.00    | 262,124,000    |
| West Virginia                | 63 -    | 0.00    | 22 +           | 8 +       | 7 +     | 15,618,000     |
| Wisconsin                    | 25 -    | 51 -    | 16.2 +         | 4.4 -     | 3.4 +   | 320,930,949    |
| Wyoming                      | 70 -    | 0.00    | 30 +           | 0.00      | 0.00    | 52,142,140     |
| Puerto Rico                  | 71.27   | 0.00    | 9.63           | 11.62     | 7.48    | 40,904,758     |
| Since 1985:                  |         |         |                |           |         |                |
| No Change                    | 10      | 21      | 8              | 14        | 17      |                |
| Number reporting<br>increase | 7       | 12      | 18             | 12        | 12      |                |
| Number reporting<br>decrease | 20      | 4       | 11             | 11        | 8       |                |

\* DID NOT PARTICIPATE

" + " and " - " indicate direction  
of change, not magnitude

TABLE 3  
SUMMARY OF SOURCES OF OPERATING FUNDS  
BY PERCENTAGE OF ALL FUNDS AVAILABLE—1988

| State   | State % | Local % | Student Fees % | Federal % | Other % |
|---------|---------|---------|----------------|-----------|---------|
| AVERAGE | 58.16   | 12.93   | 21.67          | 2.70      | 4.23    |
| STD DEV | 19.12   | 17.42   | 10.87          | 3.78      | 5.88    |
| MAX VAL | 100.00  | 51.50   | 56.00          | 17.00     | 14.30   |
| MIN VAL | 25.00   | 0.00    | 0.00           | 0.00      | 0.00    |

The relationship between each of the sources of funds as a percentage of the total and the total funds reported by each state are described in Table 4. While caution is advised in the interpretation of these findings due to missing data and incomplete reporting, several observations can be made. The greatest correlation ( $-.37$ ) was found between percentage contribution of student fees to total funds available where total funds explained 14 percent of the variance in student fees. The negative relationship indicated that as total funds increased, the percentage of student fees decreased. Although the magnitude of the other relationships for percentage of federal ( $-.22$ ) and state ( $-.15$ ) were less, they were also negatively directed. The relationship between percentage contribution from local sources to total funds available was the lone positively directed relationship. However, the low, insignificant correlation ( $0.08$ ) explains less than 1 percent of the variance in total funds. In other words, increases in student fees did not result in increases in total revenue; only increases in the level of local support positively correlated with revenue.

**TABLE 4**  
CORRELATIONAL ANALYSIS FOR SOURCES OF FUNDS BY  
PERCENTAGE COMPARED WITH TOTAL DOLLARS AVAILABLE

|                | Covariance    | Correlation | R-squared |
|----------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|
| % STATE        | -973955785.17 | -.15        | .02       |
| % LOCAL        | 571785682.55  | .08         | .01       |
| % STUDENT FEES | -1.3E9        | -.37        | .14       |
| % FEDERAL      | -200685942.12 | -.22        | .05       |
| % OTHER        | -44267687.83  | -.03        | 0.00073   |

State appropriations for educational systems are shown in Table 5. Expenditures are listed in the following categories: public schools, vocational schools, community colleges, and other higher education. California heads the list in dollars expended on community colleges, with over \$1.28 billion or 7 percent of the total state expenditure on education. As a percentage of total education expenditures spent on community colleges, Florida is first, with 8.57 percent, North Carolina is second (8.27 percent), and West Virginia is last (1.08 percent). The average of the percentages reported for community colleges is 4.95 percent.

Table 6 indicates the sources for state funds, a major funding source for a majority of the respondents. Sales and income taxes remain the primary sources of state funds. Only 10 states report use of the property tax as a source of revenue for the state's general fund. In 1985-86, only two states indicated that income was derived from a state lottery and used to fund community colleges. However, 15 states currently identify lottery money as a source of funding for the general operating expenditures of community colleges.

Those states that allocated funds based on the cost of programs are identified in Table 7. Seventeen states (45 percent) reported at least partial funding based on program costs, while 21 states (55 percent) indicated that this is not a factor in the allocation process. One state, Oregon, indicated that it was considering a change to a program-cost basis.

Several states reported changes in the method of financing community colleges since FY 1986. These changes are reported in Table 8. At the state level, changes occur in the use of one of the following categories:

- General purpose grants/appropriations
- Restricted purpose grants/appropriations
- Funding formulae

As indicated in Table 8, eight states began using formula-based funding plans since FY 1986. One state started using state general funds to support community college operations, and one state began using restricted funds for support.

Local changes could have occurred as a result of increases in tax rates or changes in tuition and student fees structures and policies. Four states indicated changes to their tuition and fee policies as a source of support; the most frequently cited difference reflects changes in funding formulae. No state reported a change to local-level taxing authority as a source of revenue for the community colleges.

The question of funding sources for non-credit courses continues to be a highly volatile issue. A cursory review of current literature reveals the division between states that assist in the financing of non-credit certificate and life-long learning courses, and those that do not. In general, little support exists for state assistance for non-credit recreation/leisure courses. (Gleazer, 1980; Martorana and Wattenbarger, 1978; Wattenbarger, 1985). This trend is supported by the findings of this report.

Table 9 displays survey data on how states currently finance non-credit courses in certificate programs, life-long learning, recreation/leisure, and job training. The count at the bottom of the table refers to the number of states that received at least some funds from a particular source. "Percentage of respondents" refers to the percentage of states that receive funds from that source out of all the states that responded to the question about that particular type of course. The overall trend continues to indicate a student-fee basis for supporting non-credit programs. State funds support certificate programs in 11 states, life-long learning programs in eight states, recreation/leisure programs in four states, and job training

programs in six states. Two states report atypical funding of non-credit job training courses. Hawaii and Nevada fund non-credit job training courses at 100 percent while all other non-credit courses are funded entirely by the student fees.

As shown in Table 10, the states are almost evenly split on the issue of whether to adopt funding procedures other than the traditional student-enrollment-driven formulae. Seventeen states currently use or are developing a funding mechanism that is not enrollment-driven.

The percentage of total state funds that are categorical or limited-use is shown by state in Table 11. Traditionally, these funds have supported economic development or vocational programs. While the use of categorical funds since 1985-86 has remained stable (six states reported an increase in the use of such funding categories and five states reported decreases), the magnitude of the percentage increases is greater than that of the states that reported decreases. For example, Florida went from 2 percent in 1985-86 to 12 percent in 1988-89, and Kentucky went from 0.1 percent to between 10 and 15 percent in the same period, whereas Connecticut went from 100 percent to 98 percent and Mississippi went from 14 percent to 5 percent, the largest decrease.

In addition, these funds are increasingly also being specified for equipment needs. Only three states indicated the use of categorical monies for equipment in 1985-86, as opposed to seven states in 1988-89.

Capital outlay totals and the source of those funds for 1988-89 are shown in Table 12. Most states report a majority of capital outlay funds as being derived from some combination of state taxes and bonds. Arkansas, Oregon, Illinois, and Wisconsin are the most notable exceptions. These states indicated local taxes and general obligation bonds as the predominant source of capital outlay monies.

There is an increasing dependence on local tax revenues in support of community colleges. Table 13 indicates where these local taxes originate. Property tax continues to be the predominant source of local revenue for community colleges, with 58 percent of the respondents indicating the use of this tax mechanism.

**TABLE 5**  
**STATE APPROPRIATIONS FOR ALL EDUCATION—1988/89**

| State             | Pub. Schools K-12 | Vocational Schools |
|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Alabama           | \$1,715,421,044   | \$42,453,654       |
| Alaska*           |                   |                    |
| Arizona           | \$1,072,819,100   |                    |
| Arkansas          |                   |                    |
| California        | \$13,291,941,000  |                    |
| Colorado*         |                   |                    |
| Connecticut       | \$648,206,352     | \$18,304,391       |
| Delaware*         |                   |                    |
| Florida           | \$4,236,213,104   | \$18,581,887       |
| Georgia           | \$2,342,645,140   | \$102,356,167      |
| Hawaii            |                   |                    |
| Idaho*            |                   |                    |
| Illinois          | \$3,315,650,000   |                    |
| Indiana           | \$1,540,864,000   | part of K-12       |
| Iowa              | \$913,400,000     |                    |
| Kansas*           |                   |                    |
| Kentucky          | \$1,459,358,500   | \$85,472,900       |
| Louisiana         | not available     |                    |
| Maine*            |                   |                    |
| Maryland          | \$1,831,379,579   | \$12,155,658       |
| Massachusetts     | \$1,651,218,036   |                    |
| Michigan          | \$2,414,030,950   |                    |
| Minnesota         | \$1,503,939,506   | \$156,777,800      |
| Mississippi       | \$769,879,066     | \$45,619,898       |
| Missouri*         |                   |                    |
| Montana*          |                   |                    |
| Nebraska*         |                   |                    |
| Nevada            | \$230,255,128     |                    |
| New Hampshire     |                   |                    |
| New Jersey        |                   |                    |
| New Mexico        | \$802,700,000     | \$18,800,000       |
| New York (SUNY)** |                   |                    |
| North Carolina    | \$2,508,572,144   |                    |
| North Dakota*     |                   |                    |
| Ohio*             |                   |                    |
| Oklahoma          | \$840,700,000     | \$62,000,000       |

Table 5—Continued

| State              | Community Colleges | Other Higher Education | CC Percent of Total |
|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Alabama            | \$86,035,051       | \$536,192,869          | 3.61%               |
| Alaska*            |                    |                        |                     |
| Arizona            | \$69,842,400       | \$431,857,600          | 4.44%               |
| Arkansas           | \$23,392,412       | \$277,363,527          | 7.78%               |
| California         | \$1,280,334,000    | \$3,623,502,000        | 7.04%               |
| Colorado*          |                    |                        |                     |
| Connecticut        | \$62,317,716       | \$327,164,538          | 5.90%               |
| Delaware*          |                    |                        |                     |
| Florida            | \$501,089,154      | \$1,088,606,730        | 8.57%               |
| Georgia            | \$66,099,290       | \$736,949,518          | 2.04%               |
| Hawaii             | \$45,984,851       |                        |                     |
| Idaho*             |                    |                        |                     |
| Illinois           | \$187,767,731      | \$1,559,479,269        | 3.71%               |
| Indiana            | \$97,513,795       | \$732,584,243          | 4.11%               |
| Iowa               | \$66,900,000       | \$390,000,000          | 4.88%               |
| Kansas*            |                    |                        |                     |
| Kentucky           | \$43,359,100       | \$535,136,100          | 2.04%               |
| Louisiana          | \$18,900,000       | \$464,000,000          |                     |
| Maine*             |                    |                        |                     |
| Maryland           | \$105,835,286      | \$570,306,957          | 4.20%               |
| Massachusetts      | \$152,468,000      | \$607,490,000          | 6.32%               |
| Michigan           | \$201,361,000      | \$1,051,750,081        | 5.49%               |
| Minnesota          | \$69,774,400       | \$617,091,300          | 2.97%               |
| Mississippi        | \$68,399,831       | \$266,238,720          | 5.95%               |
| Missouri*          |                    |                        |                     |
| Montana*           |                    |                        |                     |
| Nebraska*          |                    |                        |                     |
| Nevada             | \$23,522,000       | \$98,403,463           | 6.68%               |
| New Hampshire      | \$17,505,078       |                        |                     |
| New Jersey         | \$109,586,000      | \$856,974,603          |                     |
| New Mexico         | \$24,000,000       | \$229,500,000          | 2.23%               |
| New York (SUNY)* * |                    |                        |                     |
| North Carolina     | \$310,769,471      | \$937,225,768          | 8.27%               |
| North Dakota*      |                    |                        |                     |
| Ohio*              |                    |                        |                     |
| Oklahoma           | \$65,600,000       | \$349,600,000          | 4.98%               |

TABLE 5—Continued

| State          | Pub. Schools K-12 | Vocational School |
|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Oregon         | \$1,023,535,000   |                   |
| Pennsylvania   | \$4,039,419,000   | \$37,221,000      |
| Rhode Island   |                   |                   |
| South Carolina |                   |                   |
| South Dakota*  |                   |                   |
| Tennessee**    |                   |                   |
| Texas          | \$5,067,718,879   | \$43,165,994      |
| Utah*          |                   |                   |
| Vermont        |                   |                   |
| Virginia       | \$2,013,232,361   |                   |
| Washington     | \$2,550,000,000   | \$38,500,000      |
| West Virginia  | \$745,065,000     | \$13,135,000      |
| Wisconsin      | \$1,558,227,200   | \$93,538,900      |
| Wyoming        |                   |                   |
| Puerto Rico    | \$1,002,637,361   | part of K-12      |

\* DID NOT PARTICIPATE

\*\* DID NOT REPORT

Table 5—Continued

| State          | Community Colleges | Other Higher Education | CC Percent of Total |
|----------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Oregon         | \$124,227,500      | \$550,854,700          | 7.51%               |
| Pennsylvania   | \$113,350,000      | \$868,634,000          | 2.24%               |
| Rhode Island   | \$28,787,000       | \$104,470,000          |                     |
| South Carolina | \$94,523,249       |                        |                     |
| South Dakota*  |                    |                        |                     |
| Tennessee**    |                    |                        |                     |
| Texas          | \$413,583,781      | \$1,829,536,320        | 5.62%               |
| Utah*          |                    |                        |                     |
| Vermont        | \$1,306,770        |                        |                     |
| Virginia       | \$202,099,527      | \$1,141,477,202        | 6.02%               |
| Washington     | \$265,500,000      | \$540,900,000          | 7.82%               |
| West Virginia  | \$10,538,000       | \$204,780,000          | 1.08%               |
| Wisconsin      |                    | \$629,931,500          |                     |
| Wyoming        | \$35,338,273       |                        |                     |
| Puerto Rico    | \$43,945,924       | \$751,954,659          | 2.44%               |
|                |                    | Average                | 4.95%               |

\* DID NOT PARTICIPATE

\*\* DID NOT REPORT

**TABLE 6**  
**SOURCES OF STATE FUNDS**  
**FOR GENERAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES**

| State           | Sales | Income | Property | Excise | Lottery        | Other          |
|-----------------|-------|--------|----------|--------|----------------|----------------|
| Alabama         | X     | X      |          |        |                | Utility tax    |
| Alaska*         |       |        |          |        |                |                |
| Arizona         | X     | X      | X        | X      |                |                |
| Arkansas        | X     | X      | X        | X      |                |                |
| California      |       |        | X        |        | X              | X <sup>1</sup> |
| Colorado*       |       |        |          |        |                |                |
| Connecticut     | X     |        | X        | X      | X              | Bond funds     |
| Delaware*       |       |        |          |        |                |                |
| Florida         | X     |        |          |        | X              |                |
| Georgia         | X     | X      | X        | X      |                |                |
| Hawaii          | X     | X      |          |        |                |                |
| Idaho*          |       |        |          |        |                |                |
| Illinois        | X     | X      |          |        |                |                |
| Indiana         | X     | X      |          | X      | X              |                |
| Iowa            | X     | X      |          |        | X <sup>2</sup> |                |
| Kansas*         |       |        |          |        |                |                |
| Kentucky        | X     | X      | X        |        |                |                |
| Louisiana       | X     | X      | X        | X      |                |                |
| Maine*          |       |        |          |        |                |                |
| Maryland**      |       |        |          |        |                |                |
| Massachusetts** |       |        |          |        |                |                |
| Michigan        | X     | X      |          | X      | X              |                |
| Minnesota       |       | X      |          |        |                |                |
| Mississippi     | X     | X      |          | X      |                |                |
| Missouri*       |       |        |          |        |                |                |
| Montana*        |       |        |          |        |                |                |
| Nebraska*       |       |        |          |        |                |                |
| Nevada          | X     |        |          |        |                |                |
| New Hampshire   |       |        |          | X      | X              | X <sup>1</sup> |
| New Jersey      | X     | X      |          | X      | X              |                |
| New Mexico      | X     | X      |          | X      |                | Severance tax  |
| New York (SUNY) | X     | X      | X        | X      | X              |                |
| North Carolina  | X     | X      |          |        |                |                |
| North Dakota*   |       |        |          |        |                |                |
| Ohio*           |       |        |          |        |                |                |
| Oklahoma**      |       |        |          |        |                |                |
| Oregon          |       |        |          |        | X <sup>4</sup> |                |

TABLE 6—Continued

| State                  | Sales | Income | Property | Excise | Lottery | Other          |
|------------------------|-------|--------|----------|--------|---------|----------------|
| Pennsylvania           | X     | X      |          |        |         | X <sup>1</sup> |
| Rhode Island           | X     | X      |          | X      | X       |                |
| South Carolina**       |       |        |          |        |         |                |
| South Dakota*          |       |        |          |        |         |                |
| Tennessee              | X     |        | X        |        |         |                |
| Texas                  | X     |        |          | X      |         |                |
| Utah*                  |       |        |          |        |         |                |
| Vermont**              |       |        |          |        |         |                |
| Virginia               | X     | X      |          | X      | X       |                |
| Washington             | X     |        |          | X      | X       |                |
| West Virginia          | X     | X      |          | X      | X       |                |
| Wisconsin              |       | X      |          |        |         |                |
| Wyoming**              |       |        |          |        |         |                |
| Puerto Rico            | X     | X      | X        | X      | X       |                |
| Count                  | 27    | 23     | 10       | 18     | 15      | 6              |
| % of Total Respondents | 84.44 | 71.87  | 31.25    | 56.25  | 46.87   | 18.75          |

\* DID NOT PARTICIPATE.

\*\* DID NOT RESPOND

<sup>1</sup>California receives federal mining subsidies.<sup>2</sup>Iowa uses a lottery to fund equipment purchases.<sup>3</sup>New Hampshire taxes business profits.<sup>4</sup>Oregon occasionally uses a lottery to fund general operating expenditures.<sup>5</sup>Pennsylvania uses a corporate income tax.

**TABLE 7**  
**FUNDS ALLOCATED ON THE BASIS OF PROGRAM COSTS**

| State           | Program Costs Used in Allocation Process  |
|-----------------|---|
| Alabama         | Yes—For allied health programs  |
| Alaska*         |   |
| Arizona         | No  |
| Arkansas        | Yes   |
| California      | No  |
| Colorado*       |   |
| Connecticut     | Yes   |
| Delaware*       |   |
| Florida         | Yes   |
| Georgia         | No  |
| Hawaii          | No  |
| Idaho*          |   |
| Illinois        | Yes   |
| Indiana         | Yes   |
| Iowa            | No  |
| Kansas*         |   |
| Kentucky        | No  |
| Louisiana       | No  |
| Maine*          |   |
| Maryland        | No  |
| Massachusetts   | Yes   |
| Michigan        | Yes—Funding based on contact hours  |
| Minnesota       | Yes   |
| Mississippi     | No  |
| Missouri*       |   |
| Montana*        |   |
| Nebraska*       |   |
| Nevada          | Yes   |
| New Hampshire   | No  |
| New Jersey      | No  |
| New Mexico      | Yes—Differential funding based on student contact<br>hours production by major program categories |
| New York (SUNY) | No  |
| North Carolina  | No  |
| North Dakota*   |   |
| Ohio*           |   |
| Oklahoma        | Yes   |
| Oregon          | No—However, this is being discussed as a possibility  |

**TABLE 7—Continued**

| State          | Program Costs Used in Allocation Process |        |
|----------------|--|--------|
| Pennsylvania   | No                                       |        |
| Rhode Island   | No                                       |        |
| South Carolina | No                                       |        |
| South Dakota*  |  |        |
| Tennessee      | Yes                                      |        |
| Texas          | Yes                                      |        |
| Utah*          |  |        |
| Vermont        | No                                       |        |
| Virginia       | Yes                                      |        |
| Washington     | Yes                                      |        |
| West Virginia  | No                                       |        |
| Wisconsin      | Yes                                      |        |
| Wyoming        | No                                       |        |
| Puerto Rico    | No                                       |        |
| Percentages    | Yes 45%                                  | No 55% |

\* DID NOT PARTICIPATE

**TABLE 8**  
**STATES WITH REPORTED CHANGES IN SUPPORT**  
**MECHANISMS SINCE FY 1986**

| State             | General<br>Purpose Funds | State Support<br>Restricted<br>Purpose Funds | Funding<br>Formulae | Local Support<br>Tax Rates | Tuition<br>and Fees |
|-------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Alabama           |                          |  | X                   |                            |                     |
| Alaska*           |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Arizona           |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Arkansas          |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| California        |                          |  | X                   |                            |                     |
| Colorado*         |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Connecticut       |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Delaware*         |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Florida           |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Georgia           |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Hawaii            |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Idaho*            |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Illinois          |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Indiana           |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Iowa              |                          |  | X                   |                            |                     |
| Kansas*           |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Kentucky          |                          |  |                     |                            | X                   |
| Louisiana         |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Maine*            |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Maryland          |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Massachusetts     |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Michigan          |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Minnesota         |                          |  | X                   |                            |                     |
| Mississippi       |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Missouri*         |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Montana*          |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Nebraska*         |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Nevada            |                          |  | X                   |                            |                     |
| New Hampshire     |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| New Jersey        |                          |  | X                   |                            |                     |
| New Mexico        |                          |  |                     |                            | X                   |
| New York (SUNY)** |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| North Carolina    |                          |  |                     |                            | X                   |
| North Dakota*     |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Ohio*             |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Oklahoma          |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |

TABLE 8—Continued

| State          | General<br>Purpose Funds | State Support<br>Restricted<br>Purpose Funds | Funding<br>Formulas | Local Support<br>Tax Rates | Tuition<br>and Fees |
|----------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Oregon         |                          | X  | X                   |                            |                     |
| Pennsylvania   |                          |  | X                   |                            |                     |
| Rhode Island   |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| South Carolina |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| South Dakota*  |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Tennessee**    |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Texas          |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Utah*          |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Vermont        |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Virginia       |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Washington     | X                        |  |                     |                            |                     |
| West Virginia  |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Wisconsin      |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Wyoming        |                          |  |                     |                            | X                   |
| Puerto Rico    |                          |  |                     |                            |                     |
| Count          | 1                        | 1  | 8                   | 0                          | 4                   |

\* DID NOT PARTICIPATE

\*\* DID NOT REPORT

**TABLE 9**  
**SOURCES OF FUNDING FOR NON-CREDIT COURSES**

| State           | Certificate Programs |         |           | Life-Long Learning |         |           |
|-----------------|----------------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|---------|-----------|
|                 | % State              | % Local | % Student | % State            | % Local | % Student |
| Alabama         | 0                    | 0       | 100       | 0                  | 0       | 100       |
| Alaska*         |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |
| Arizona         | 0                    | 0       | 100       | 0                  | 0       | 100       |
| Arkansas        |                      |         |           | 0                  | 0       | 100       |
| California      | 65                   | 35      | 0         | 0                  | 10      | 90        |
| Colorado*       |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |
| Connecticut     | 5                    | 0       | 95        | 1                  | 0       | 99        |
| Delaware*       |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |
| Florida**       |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |
| Georgia         | 0                    | 0       | 100       | 0                  | 0       | 100       |
| Hawaii          | 0                    | 0       | 100       | 0                  | 0       | 100       |
| Idaho*          |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |
| Illinois        | 0                    | 0       | 100       | 0                  | 0       | 100       |
| Indiana         | 66                   | 0       | 34        | 66                 | 0       | 34        |
| Iowa**          |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |
| Kansas*         |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |
| Kentucky        | 0                    | 0       | 100       | 0                  | 0       | 100       |
| Louisiana**     |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |
| Maine*          |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |
| Maryland        | 33.3                 | 33.3    | 33.3      | 33.3               | 33.3    | 33.3      |
| Massachusetts** |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |
| Michigan**      |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |
| Minnesota       | 47                   | 0       | 53        | 47                 | 0       | 53        |
| Mississippi     | 0                    | 0       | 100       | 0                  | 0       | 100       |
| Missouri*       |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |
| Montana*        |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |
| Nebraska*       |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |
| Nevada          | 0                    | 0       | 100       | 0                  | 0       | 100       |
| New Hampshire   | 0                    | 0       | 100       | 0                  | 0       | 100       |
| New Jersey**    |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |
| New Mexico**    |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |
| New York (SUNY) | 33.2                 | 32.6    | 27.4      | 33.2               | 32.6    | 27.4      |
| North Carolina  | 100                  | 0       | 0         | 100                | 0       | 0         |
| North Dakota*   |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |
| Ohio*           |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |
| Oklahoma**      |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |

TABLE 9—Continued

| State           | Recreation/Lisure |            |              | Job Training |            |              |
|-----------------|-------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
|                 | %<br>State        | %<br>Local | %<br>Student | %<br>State   | %<br>Local | %<br>Student |
| Alabama         | 0                 | 0          | 100          | 0            | 0          | 100          |
| Alaska*         |                   |            |              |              |            |              |
| Arizona         | 0                 | 0          | 100          |              |            |              |
| Arkansas        | 0                 | 0          | 100          |              |            |              |
| California      | 0                 | 5          | 95           |              |            |              |
| Colorado*       |                   |            |              |              |            |              |
| Connecticut     | 1                 | 0          | 99           | 40           | 0          | 60           |
| Delaware*       |                   |            |              |              |            |              |
| Florida**       |                   |            |              |              |            |              |
| Georgia         | 0                 | 0          | 100          | 0            | 0          | 100          |
| Hawaii          | 0                 | 0          | 100          | 100          | 0          | 0            |
| Idaho*          |                   |            |              |              |            |              |
| Illinois        | 0                 | 0          | 100          | 0            | 0          | 100          |
| Indiana         | 66                | 0          | 34           | 66           | 0          | 34           |
| Iowa**          |                   |            |              |              |            |              |
| Kansas*         |                   |            |              |              |            |              |
| Kentucky        | 0                 | 0          | 100          |              |            |              |
| Louisiana**     |                   |            |              |              |            |              |
| Maine*          |                   |            |              |              |            |              |
| Maryland        |                   |            |              |              |            |              |
| Massachusetts** |                   |            |              |              |            |              |
| Michigan**      |                   |            |              |              |            |              |
| Minnesota       | 0                 | 0          | 100          |              |            |              |
| Mississippi     | 0                 | 0          | 100          |              |            |              |
| Missouri*       |                   |            |              |              |            |              |
| Montana*        |                   |            |              |              |            |              |
| Nebraska*       |                   |            |              |              |            |              |
| Nevada          | 0                 | 0          | 100          | 100          | 0          | 0            |
| New Hampshire   | 0                 | 0          | 100          | 0            | 0          | 100          |
| New Jersey**    |                   |            |              |              |            |              |
| New Mexico**    |                   |            |              |              |            |              |
| New York (SUNY) | 0                 | 50         | 50           | 0            | 0          | 100          |
| North Carolina  | 0                 | 0          | 100          |              |            |              |
| North Dakota*   |                   |            |              |              |            |              |
| Ohio*           |                   |            |              |              |            |              |
| Oklahoma**      |                   |            |              |              |            |              |

TABLE 9—Continued

| State                                   | Certificate Programs |         |           | Life-Long Learning |         |           |
|---|----------------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|---------|-----------|
|   | % State              | % Local | % Student | % State            | % Local | % Student |
| Oregon                                  | 30                   | 50      | 20        | 30                 | 50      | 20        |
| Pennsylvania                            | 33.3                 | 33.3    | 33.3      | 33.3               | 33.3    | 33.3      |
| Rhode Island                            | 0                    | 0       | 100       | 0                  | 0       | 100       |
| South Carolina                          | 0                    | 0       | 100       | 0                  | 0       | 100       |
| South Dakota*                           |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |
| Tennessee                               | 0                    | 0       | 100       | 0                  | 0       | 100       |
| Texas                                   | V                    | V       | V         | 0                  | 50      | 50        |
| Utah*                                   |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |
| Vermont                                 | 0                    | 0       | 100       | 0                  | 0       | 100       |
| Virginia                                | 0                    | 0       | 100       | 0                  | 0       | 100       |
| Washington                              | 85                   | 0       | 15        | 0                  | 0       | 100       |
| West Virginia                           | 0                    | 0       | 100       | 0                  | 0       | 100       |
| Wisconsin**                             |                      |         |           |                    |         |           |
| Wyoming                                 | 0                    | 0       | 100       | 0                  | 0       | 100       |
| Puerto Rico                             | 0                    | 0       | 100       | 0                  | 0       | 100       |
| Number of respondents with some funding | 11                   | 6       | 26        | 8                  | 6       | 28        |
| Percentage of respondents               | 39%                  | 21%     | 93%       | 28%                | 21%     | 97%       |

\* DID NOT PARTICIPATE

\*\* DID NOT REPORT

V Percentages vary

TABLE 9—Continued

| State                                   | Recreation/Leisure |         |           | Job Training |         |           |
|---|--------------------|---------|-----------|--------------|---------|-----------|
|   | % State            | % Local | % Student | % State      | % Local | % Student |
| Oregon                                  | V                  | V       | V         | 30           | 50      | 20        |
| Pennsylvania                            | 33.3               | 33.3    | 33.3      | 33.3         | 33.3    | 33.3      |
| Rhode Island                            |                    |         |           | 0            | 0       | 100       |
| South Carolina                          | 0                  | 0       | 100       | 0            | 0       | 100       |
| South Dakota*                           |                    |         |           |              |         |           |
| Tennessee                               | 0                  | 0       | 100       | 0            | 0       | 100       |
| Texas                                   | 0                  | 50      | 50        | 0            | 50      | 50        |
| Utah*                                   |                    |         |           |              |         |           |
| Vermont                                 | 0                  | 0       | 100       | 0            | 0       | 100       |
| Virginia                                | 0                  | 0       | 100       | 0            | 0       | 100       |
| Washington                              | 0                  | 0       | 100       |              |         |           |
| West Virginia                           | 0                  | 0       | 100       | 0            | 0       | 100       |
| Wisconsin**                             |                    |         |           |              |         |           |
| Wyoming                                 | 0                  | 0       | 100       | 0            | 0       | 100       |
| Puerto Rico                             | 0                  | 0       | 100       | 0            | 0       | 100       |
| Number of respondents with some funding | 4                  | 5       | 27        | 6            | 3       | 18        |
| Percentage of respondents               | 15%                | 19%     | 100%      | 30%          | 15%     | 90%       |

\* DID NOT PARTICIPATE

\*\* DID NOT REPORT

V Percentages vary

**TABLE 10**  
**FUNDING FOR OPERATIONS BY OTHER THAN**  
**ENROLLMENT CALCULATIONS**

| State           | No | Yes | Basis for Support                                |
|-----------------|----|-----|--|
| Alabama         |    | X   | Developing formula similiar to Oregon's          |
| Alaska*         |    |     |  |
| Arizona         | X  |     |  |
| Arkansas        |    | X   | Building maintenance not enrollment-driven       |
| California      |    | X   |  |
| Colorado*       |    |     |  |
| Connecticut     |    | X   |  |
| Delaware*       |    |     |  |
| Florida         |    | X   |  |
| Georgia         | X  |     |  |
| Hawaii          |    | X   |  |
| Idaho*          |    |     |  |
| Illinois        | X  |     |  |
| Indiana         |    | X   |  |
| Iowa            | X  |     |  |
| Kansas*         |    |     |  |
| Kentucky        |    | X   | Based on credit hr. enrollment by CIP discipline |
| Louisiana       |    | X   | Developing a peer analysis formula               |
| Maine*          |    |     |  |
| Maryland        |    | X   |  |
| Massachusetts   |    | X   |  |
| Michigan        | X  |     |  |
| Minnesota       | X  |     |  |
| Mississippi     | X  |     |  |
| Missouri*       |    |     |  |
| Montana*        |    |     |  |
| Nebraska*       |    |     |  |
| Nevada          | X  |     |  |
| New Hampshire   | X  |     |  |
| New Jersey      | X  |     |  |
| New Mexico      |    | X   | Based on a workload formula                      |
| New York (SUNY) | X  |     |  |
| North Carolina  | X  |     |  |
| North Dakota*   |    |     |  |
| Ohio*           |    |     |  |
| Oklahoma        |    | X   | Still in development stage                       |

TABLE 10—Continued

| State          | No | Yes | Basis for Support   |
|----------------|----|-----|---|
| Oregon         |    | X   | Still in development stage  |
| Pennsylvania   | X  |     |   |
| Rhode Island   | X  |     |   |
| South Carolina | X  |     |   |
| South Dakota*  |    |     |   |
| Tennessee      |    | X   | Performance funding   |
| Texas          | X  |     |   |
| Utah*          |    |     |   |
| Vermont        |    | X   | Based on previous budget + inflation factor<br>+ adjustments for special projects |
| Virginia       | X  |     |   |
| Washington     | X  |     |   |
| West Virginia  | X  |     |   |
| Wisconsin      |    | X   | Expenditure-driven formula  |
| Wyoming        | X  |     |   |
| Puerto Rico**  |    |     |   |

\* DID NOT PARTICIPATE

\*\* DID NOT REPORT

**TABLE 11**  
**PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL STATE FUNDS IN SUPPORT**  
**OF CATEGORICAL PROGRAMS**

| State           | Percent Categorical | Categorically Supported Programs   |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| Alabama         | 2.16                | Prison education; library enhancement; high tech equipment   |
| Alaska*         |                     |  |
| Arizona         | 0                   |  |
| Arkansas        | 0                   |  |
| California      | 7.25                | Transfer centers; educational opportunity services; disabled student services; firefighter education                         |
| Colorado*       |                     |  |
| Connecticut     | 98                  | Personal services; other expenses; equipment   |
| Delaware*       |                     |  |
| Florida         | 12                  | Instructional equipment; deferred maintenance; library automation; learning resource centers and literacy programs           |
| Georgia**       |                     |  |
| Hawaii          | 0                   |  |
| Idaho*          |                     |  |
| Illinois        | 6.8                 | Disadvantaged student grants; economic development grants; advanced technology grants  |
| Indiana**       |                     |  |
| Iowa            | 1.39                | Miscellaneous services   |
| Kansas*         |                     |  |
| Kentucky        | 10-15               | Debt service   |
| Louisiana**     |                     |  |
| Maine*          |                     |  |
| Maryland**      |                     |  |
| Massachusetts** |                     |  |
| Michigan        |                     | Construction and renovation; job training centers; investment fund; instructional equipment; facility repair and replacement |
| Minnesota       | 3.1                 | Associate degree in nursing educational support  |
| Mississippi     | 5                   |  |
| Missouri*       |                     |  |
| Montana*        |                     |  |

TABLE 11—Continued

| State             | Percent<br>Categorical | Categorically Supported Programs  |
|-------------------|------------------------|---|
| Nebraska*         |                        |   |
| Nevada**          |                        |   |
| New Hampshire**   |                        |   |
| New Jersey        | 22                     | Challenge grants; debt service; high tech programs; minor capital improvements; fringe benefits                         |
| New Mexico**      |                        |   |
| New York (SUNY)** |                        |   |
| North Carolina    | 14                     | Equipment; library books; new industries training; human resource development; small business grants; staff development |
| North Dakota*     |                        |   |
| Ohio*             |                        |   |
| Oklahoma**        |                        |   |
| Oregon            | 12                     | Job training targeted to specific industries or companies   |
| Pennsylvania**    |                        |   |
| Rhode Island      |                        | \$180,000 in '89-90, targeted for fixed asset protection projects   |
| South Carolina    | 9                      | Industrial and innovation job retraining; equipment   |
| South Dakota*     |                        |   |
| Tennessee**       |                        |   |
| Texas**           |                        |   |
| Utah*             |                        |   |
| Vermont           | 1                      | Library books   |
| Virginia**        |                        |   |
| Washington        | 1                      | Equipment; assessment   |
| West Virginia**   |                        |   |
| Wisconsin         | 3                      | Basic skills programs; emerging occupational programs   |
| Wyoming**         |                        |   |
| Puerto Rico       | 14                     | Capital improvement projects  |

\* DID NOT PARTICIPATE

\*\* DID NOT REPORT

**TABLE 12**  
**SOURCES OF FUNDS FOR CAPITAL OUTLAY—1988**

| State             | Total Amount Available | Local Taxes/Bonds | State Taxes/Bonds | Other \$    |
|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| Alabama           | \$15,674,317           |                   | \$8,607,591       | \$3,917,342 |
| Alaska*           |                        |                   |                   |             |
| Arizona           | \$47,988,798           | \$14,452,542      | \$12,973,413      |             |
| Arkansas          | \$2,796,644            | \$2,796,644       |                   |             |
| California        | \$89,429,000           |                   | \$89,429,000      |             |
| Colorado*         |                        |                   |                   |             |
| Connecticut       | \$4,272,572            |                   | \$4,272,574       |             |
| Delaware*         |                        |                   |                   |             |
| Florida           | \$89,619,256           |                   | \$89,619,256      |             |
| Georgia           | \$4,244,556            |                   | \$2,943,384       | \$1,301,172 |
| Hawaii            | \$3,140,000            |                   | \$3,140,000       |             |
| Idaho*            |                        |                   |                   |             |
| Illinois          | \$36,856,501           | \$31,738,101      | \$5,118,400       |             |
| Indiana           | \$6,599,009            |                   |                   |             |
| Iowa              | \$10,819,629           |                   |                   | \$5,195,902 |
| Kansas*           |                        |                   |                   |             |
| Kentucky          |                        |                   |                   |             |
| Louisiana**       |                        |                   |                   |             |
| Maine*            |                        |                   |                   |             |
| Maryland          |                        |                   | \$4,200,000       |             |
| Massachusetts     | \$3,256,980            |                   | \$3,256,980       |             |
| Michigan          | \$198,752,300          |                   | \$6,000,000       |             |
| Minnesota         | \$370,972,200          |                   | \$34,960,000      |             |
| Mississippi       | \$11,360,000           |                   |                   |             |
| Missouri*         |                        |                   |                   |             |
| Montana*          |                        |                   |                   |             |
| Nebraska*         |                        |                   |                   |             |
| Nevada            | \$2,200,000            |                   | \$2,200,000       |             |
| New Hampshire     |                        |                   | \$737,468         |             |
| New Jersey        | \$1,000,000            |                   | \$1,000,000       |             |
| New Mexico        |                        |                   | \$5,200,000       |             |
| New York (SUNY)** |                        |                   |                   |             |
| North Carolina    | \$51,335,999           | \$25,447,874      | \$25,888,125      |             |
| North Dakota*     |                        |                   |                   |             |
| Ohio*             |                        |                   |                   |             |
| Oklahoma          | \$1,048,000            |                   |                   |             |
| Oregon            | \$11,909,773           | \$8,298,730       | \$3,611,043       |             |

TABLE 12--Continued

| State          | Total Amount<br>Available | Local<br>Taxes/Bonds | State<br>Taxes/Bonds | Other 1   |
|----------------|---------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------|
| Pennsylvania   |                           |                      | \$24,019,500         |           |
| Rhode Island   | \$1,072,128               |                      |                      |           |
| South Carolina | \$7,902,918               |                      |                      |           |
| South Dakota*  |                           |                      |                      |           |
| Tennessee**    |                           |                      |                      |           |
| Texas**        |                           |                      |                      |           |
| Utah*          |                           |                      |                      |           |
| Vermont**      |                           |                      |                      |           |
| Virginia       | \$20,000,000              | \$5,000,000          | \$15,000,000         |           |
| Washington     | \$65,000,000              |                      |                      |           |
| West Virginia  | \$501,000                 |                      |                      |           |
| Wisconsin      | \$30,569,842              | \$23,442,620         | \$6,892,130          | \$235,092 |
| Wyoming        | \$2,150,000               |                      |                      |           |
| Puerto Rico    | \$10,238,600              |                      | \$10,238,600         |           |

\* DID NOT PARTICIPATE

\*\* DID NOT REPORT

**TABLE 13**  
**SOURCES OF LOCAL TAX REVENUE IN SUPPORT**  
**OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES**

| State           | None | Property Tax | Excise Tax | Other Taxes |
|-----------------|------|--------------|------------|-------------|
| Alabama         | X    |              |            |             |
| Alaska*         |      |              |            |             |
| Arizona         |      | X            |            |             |
| Arkansas        |      | X            |            |             |
| California      |      | X            |            |             |
| Colorado*       |      |              |            |             |
| Connecticut     | X    |              |            |             |
| Delaware*       |      |              |            |             |
| Florida         | X    |              |            |             |
| Georgia         | X    |              |            |             |
| Hawaii**        |      |              |            |             |
| Idaho*          |      |              |            |             |
| Illinois        |      | X            |            |             |
| Indiana         | X    |              |            |             |
| Iowa            |      | X            |            |             |
| Kansas*         |      |              |            |             |
| Kentucky        | X    |              |            |             |
| Louisiana**     |      |              |            |             |
| Maine*          |      |              |            |             |
| Maryland        | X    |              |            |             |
| Massachusetts   | X    |              |            |             |
| Michigan        |      | X            |            |             |
| Minnesota       | X    |              |            |             |
| Mississippi     |      | X            |            |             |
| Missouri*       |      |              |            |             |
| Montana*        |      |              |            |             |
| Nebraska*       |      |              |            |             |
| Nevada          | X    |              |            |             |
| New Hampshire** |      |              |            |             |
| New Jersey      |      | X            |            |             |
| New Mexico      |      | X            |            |             |
| New York (SUNY) |      | X            | X          |             |
| North Carolina  |      | X            |            |             |
| North Dakota*   |      |              |            |             |
| Ohio*           |      |              |            |             |
| Oklahoma        |      | X            |            |             |
| Oregon          |      | X            |            |             |

TABLE 13—Continued

| State                | None | Property Tax | Excise Tax | Other Taxes |
|----------------------|------|--------------|------------|-------------|
| Pennsylvania         |      | X            |            | X           |
| Rhode Island         | X    |              |            |             |
| South Carolina       |      | X            |            |             |
| South Dakota *       |      |              |            |             |
| Tennessee            | X    |              |            |             |
| Texas                |      | X            |            |             |
| Utah *               |      |              |            |             |
| Vermont **           |      |              |            |             |
| Virginia             |      | X            |            |             |
| Washington           |      | X            |            |             |
| West Virginia        | X    |              |            |             |
| Wisconsin            |      | X            |            |             |
| Wyoming              |      | X            |            |             |
| Puerto Rico          |      |              |            | X           |
| Count                | 13   | 20           | 1          | 2           |
| % of Total Reporting | 38   | 58           | 3          | 6           |

\* DID NOT PARTICIPATE

\*\* DID NOT REPORT

## PART II

### EXPENDITURES FOR THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

**D**ata on mean expenditures per full-time equivalent (FTE) student and comparable data for 1985 are shown in Table 14. Unduplicated full-time (FT) and part-time (PT) headcount as well as annual full-time equivalent student enrollment figures are listed. Only Arkansas, Connecticut, Mississippi, and Wyoming report spending less per FTE student than they did in 1985-86. New Jersey (28 percent) and Indiana (23 percent) reported the largest increases in expenditure per FTE. There was an 8.55 percent overall increase in the expenditures for credit programs. It is interesting to note that Alabama is the only state reporting more FT students than PT.

States in rank order by expenditure per FTE enrollment are listed in Table 15. The average expenditure was \$3,886, with New Hampshire reporting the highest expenditure (\$6,827) and Vermont the lowest (\$2,706). The five states with the largest annual FT equivalent enrollment are California, Texas, Illinois, Florida, and New York-SUNY. The top five states in expenditure per pupil were New Hampshire, Wisconsin, Georgia, Alabama, and New York-SUNY.

**TABLE 14**  
**EXPENDITURES FOR CREDIT PROGRAMS—1988**

| State           | \$ per<br>FTE<br>1988 | \$ per<br>FTE<br>1985 | %<br>Change | Unduplicated Headcount |           | Annual<br>FTE |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------|---------------|
|                 |                       |                       |             | Full-Time              | Part-Time |               |
| Alabama         | \$5,370               | \$4,458               | 20          | 28,973                 | 25,100    | 40,162        |
| Alaska*         |                       |                       |             |                        |           |               |
| Arizona         | \$3,624               | \$3,454               | 5           | 25,754                 | 111,414   | 57,281        |
| Arkansas        | \$3,835               | \$5,092               | -25         | 4,808                  | 5,726     | 7,180         |
| California      | \$3,051               | \$3,007               | 1           | 275,347                | 989,062   | 675,613       |
| Colorado*       |                       | \$3,202               |             |                        |           |               |
| Connecticut     | \$4,148               | \$4,511               | -8          | 6,521                  | 23,659    | 13,356        |
| Delaware*       |                       | \$3,814               |             |                        |           |               |
| Florida         | \$3,987               | \$3,620               | 10          | 866,168                |           | 145,009       |
| Georgia         | \$5,519               |                       |             |                        |           | 16,601        |
| Hawaii**        |                       |                       |             |                        |           |               |
| Idaho*          |                       | \$5,821               |             |                        |           |               |
| Illinois        | \$3,586               | \$2,744               | 31          | 148,166                | 497,939   | 180,003       |
| Indiana         | \$4,103               | \$3,332               | 23          | 14,995                 | 22,565    | 22,067        |
| Iowa            | \$3,003               | \$2,633               | 14          | 58,260                 | 505,172   | 57,111        |
| Kansas*         |                       | \$4,072               |             |                        |           |               |
| Kentucky        | \$3,090               |                       |             | 12,596                 | 17,180    | 16,478        |
| Louisiana       |                       | \$3,349               |             |                        |           | 9,713         |
| Maine*          |                       |                       |             |                        |           |               |
| Maryland        | \$3,341               | \$2,855               | 17          |                        |           | 70,706        |
| Massachusetts   | \$3,910               |                       |             | 41,775                 |           | 32,718        |
| Michigan        | \$3,881               | \$3,461               | 12          | 55,069                 | 160,015   | 114,538       |
| Minnesota       | \$3,827               | \$3,700               | 3           |                        | 67,550    | 27,592        |
| Mississippi     | \$2,848               | \$2,998               | -5          |                        |           | 46,944        |
| Missouri*       |                       | \$4,218               |             |                        |           |               |
| Montana*        |                       | \$3,553               |             |                        |           |               |
| Nebraska*       |                       | \$3,532               |             |                        |           |               |
| Nevada          | \$3,171               | \$2,912               | 9           |                        | 26,155    | 8,364         |
| New Hampshire   | \$6,827               |                       |             |                        | 2,751     |               |
| New Jersey      | \$4,799               | \$3,756               | 28          |                        |           | 65,058        |
| New Mexico      | \$3,785               |                       |             |                        |           | 10,674        |
| New York (SUNY) | \$4,858               | \$4,258               | 14          | 80,630                 | 150,835   | 127,114       |
| North Carolina  |                       | \$2,172               |             |                        |           | 85,448        |
| North Dakota*   |                       |                       |             |                        |           |               |
| Ohio*           |                       | \$5,041               |             |                        |           |               |
| Oklahoma        | \$3,020               |                       |             |                        |           | 29,999        |

TABLE 14—Continued

| State          | \$ per<br>FTE<br>1988 | \$ per<br>FTE<br>1985 | %<br>Change | Unduplicated Headcount |           | Annual<br>FTE |
|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------|---------------|
|                |                       |                       |             | Full Time              | Part Time |               |
| Oregon         | \$4,020               | \$3,421               | 18          |                        | 280,708   | 52,850        |
| Pennsylvania   | \$2,907               |                       |             |                        |           | 76,815        |
| Rhode Island   | \$4,655               | \$4,135               | 13          | 4,174                  | 8,933     | 1,681         |
| South Carolina | \$3,249               | \$3,003               | 8           | 34,516                 |           | 25,652        |
| South Dakota*  |                       |                       |             |                        |           |               |
| Tennessee**    |                       | \$4,740               |             |                        |           |               |
| Texas          | \$3,362               |                       |             |                        |           | 235,862       |
| Utah*          |                       | \$5,063               |             |                        |           |               |
| Vermont        | \$2,706               |                       |             | 150                    | 5,369     | 1,325         |
| Virginia       | \$3,735               | \$3,604               | 4           |                        |           | 58,080        |
| Washington     | \$3,029               | \$2,932               | 3           | 64,781                 | 68,057    | 84,304        |
| West Virginia  | \$3,059               | \$2,894               | 6           |                        |           | 5,014         |
| Wisconsin      | \$5,813               | \$5,097               | 14          |                        |           | 55,451        |
| Wyoming        | \$4,725               | \$5,267               | -10         |                        |           |               |
| Puerto Rico    | \$3,307               |                       |             |                        |           | 12,368        |
| Average        | \$3,887               | \$3,770               | 8.55%       | 100,158                | 164,899   | 72,798        |

\* DID NOT PARTICIPATE

\*\* DID NOT RESPOND

**TABLE 15**  
**EXPENDITURES PER FTE, FTE, AND PERCENT CHANGE—**  
**1988 AND 1985, AND RANK BY EXPENDITURE—1988**

| Rank<br>1988 | State           | Expenditure<br>per FTE | Annual FTE |         | "n"<br>Change |
|--------------|-----------------|------------------------|------------|---------|---------------|
|              |                 |                        | 1988       | 1985    |               |
| 1            | New Hampshire   | \$6,827.00             |            |         |               |
| 2            | Wisconsin       | \$5,813.00             | 55,452     | 51,349  | 7.99          |
| 3            | Georgia         | \$5,519.00             | 16,601     | 13,447  | 23.46         |
| 4            | Alabama         | \$5,370.00             | 40,162     | 44,978  | - 10.71       |
| 5            | New York (SUNY) | \$4,858.00             | 127,114    | 126,074 | 0.82          |
| 6            | New Jersey      | \$4,799.00             | 65,058     | 66,025  | - 1.46        |
| 7            | Wyoming         | \$4,725.00             |            | 10,217  |               |
| 8            | Rhode Island    | \$4,655.00             | 7,681      | 6,520   | 17.81         |
| 9            | Connecticut     | \$4,148.00             | 13,356     | 2,978   | 348.49        |
| 10           | Indiana         | \$4,103.00             | 22,067     | 23,293  | - 5.26        |
| 11           | Oregon          | \$4,020.00             | 52,850     | 48,268  | 9.49          |
| 12           | Florida         | \$3,987.52             | 145,009    | 132,833 | 9.17          |
| 13           | Massachusetts   | \$3,910.00             |            | 32,718  |               |
| 14           | Michigan        | \$3,881.00             | 114,538    | 109,925 | 4.20          |
| 15           | Arkansas        | \$3,834.55             | 7,180      | 6,418   | 11.87         |
| 16           | Minnesota       | \$3,827.00             | 27,592     | 24,237  | 13.84         |
| 17           | New Mexico      | \$3,785.00             | 10,674     | 7,127   | 49.77         |
| 18           | Virginia        | \$3,735.00             | 58,080     | 51,380  | 13.04         |
| 19           | Arizona         | \$3,624.00             | 57,281     | 50,101  | 14.33         |
| 20           | Illinois        | \$3,586.00             | 180,003    | 181,687 | - 0.93        |
| 21           | Texas           | \$3,362.00             | 235,862    |         |               |
| 22           | Maryland        | \$3,341.00             | 70,706     |         |               |
| 23           | Puerto Rico     | \$3,307.00             | 12,369     |         |               |
| 24           | South Carolina  | \$3,249.00             | 25,652     | 27,600  | - 7.06        |
| 25           | Nevada          | \$3,171.00             | 8,364      | 7,366   | 13.55         |
| 26           | Kentucky        | \$3,090.00             | 16,478     |         |               |
| 27           | West Virginia   | \$3,059.00             | 5,014      | 4,783   | 4.83          |
| 28           | California      | \$3,051.00             | 675,613    | 659,499 | 2.44          |
| 29           | Washington      | \$3,029.00             | 84,304     | 83,555  | 0.90          |
| 30           | Oklahoma        | \$3,020.00             | 29,999     |         |               |
| 31           | Iowa            | \$3,003.00             | 57,111     | 52,247  | 9.31          |
| 32           | Pennsylvania    | \$2,907.00             | 76,815     | 74,245  | 3.46          |
| 33           | Mississippi     | \$2,848.00             | 46,944     | 41,907  | 12.02         |
| 34           | Vermont         | \$2,706.00             | 1,325      |         |               |
|              | Alaska*         |                        |            |         |               |
|              | Colorado*       |                        |            | 19,600  |               |

TABLE 15—Continued

| Rank<br>1988 | State          | Expenditure<br>per FTE | Annual FTE |         | Change  |
|--------------|----------------|------------------------|------------|---------|---------|
|              |                |                        | 1988       | 1985    |         |
|              | Delaware*      |                        |            | 5,951   |         |
|              | Hawaii**       |                        |            | 2,580   |         |
|              | Idaho*         |                        |            |         |         |
|              | Kansas*        |                        |            |         |         |
|              | Louisiana      |                        | 9,713      | 4,996   | 94.42   |
|              | Maine*         |                        |            |         |         |
|              | Missouri*      |                        |            | 28,241  |         |
|              | Montana*       |                        |            | 1,823   |         |
|              | Nebraska*      |                        |            | 17,027  |         |
|              | North Carolina |                        | 85,448     | 88,903  | - 3.89  |
|              | North Dakota*  |                        |            |         |         |
|              | Ohio*          |                        |            | 31,759  |         |
|              | South Dakota*  |                        |            |         |         |
|              | Tennessee**    |                        |            | 76,409  |         |
|              | Utah*          |                        |            | 13,342  |         |
|              | Average        | \$38,342.39            | 45,771     | 59,424  | 22.51   |
|              | Maximum        | \$675,613.00           | 675,613    | 659,499 | 348.49  |
|              | Minimum        | \$1,325.00             | 1,325      | 0       | - 10.71 |

\* DID NOT PARTICIPATE

\*\* DID NOT RESPOND

## PART III

### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

**S**tudent tuition is a sensitive topic for community colleges, given their historical commitment to accessible, low-cost education for all students (Vaughan, 1984). Table 16 displays the tuition and fee percentage increases since 1985-86 by state. Percentage increases are shown for in-district, in-state, and out-of-state students. Sixteen states reported increases in in-district tuition for the period. New Mexico (30 percent) and Wisconsin (29 percent) posted the greatest increases. Twenty-nine states reported increases in in-state tuition, and 26 states indicated increases in out-of-state tuition. Seven states reported an increase of at least 20 percent for in-district or in-state students, which is down slightly from the 10 states reporting such an increase in the 1985-86 survey. Texas reported the largest percentage increase for in-state students, at 52 percent, while North Carolina reported a 175 percent increase in out-of-state tuition, the largest gain in any category. Minnesota actually decreased out-of-state tuition 21 percent, and Virginia decreased in-state tuition by 4.5 percent.

Survey results displayed in Table 17 show the percentage changes in student financial aid since 1985-88. While most states reported an increase in student financial aid, there are notable exceptions. Connecticut indicated a 52 percent decrease in federal financial aid and a 73 percent increase in state financial aid. New Jersey and Maryland also reported a significant decrease in federal financial aid. Only Alabama reported a significant increase in federal support for financial aid (141 percent).

Community colleges face a variety of critical financing problems. Table 18 lists state responses to the survey query on the most critical problems. Frequently cited problems continue to include chronic underfunding, inadequate faculty salaries, and limited state resources. New issues noted by several respondents included capital outlay and construction needs, the need for funds for minority student support, and problems with the property tax and sales tax base used to support operating expenses. It is interesting to note that no respondents indicated they were experiencing enrollment problems.

**TABLE 16**  
**TUITION AND FEE INCREASES (AS PERCENTAGES)**  
**SINCE 1985**

| State             | In-District   | In-State      | Out-of-State  |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Alabama**         |               |               |               |
| Alaska*           |               |               |               |
| Arizona           | 18.00         | 3.00          | 23.00         |
| Arkansas          | 7.00          | 6.00          | 6.00          |
| California**      |               |               |               |
| Colorado*         |               |               |               |
| Connecticut       | 21.00         | 20.50         | 20.40         |
| Delaware*         |               |               |               |
| Florida           |               | 22.50         | 14.90         |
| Georgia**         |               |               |               |
| Hawaii**          |               |               |               |
| Idaho*            |               |               |               |
| Illinois          | 10.30         | 11.60         | 12.70         |
| Indiana           |               | 12.60         | 12.60         |
| Iowa              |               | 11.52         | 50.99         |
| Kansas*           |               |               |               |
| Kentucky          |               | 24.80         | 49.60         |
| Louisiana**       |               |               |               |
| Maine*            |               |               |               |
| Maryland          | 10.00         | 11.00         | 14.00         |
| Massachusetts     | less than 1.0 | less than 1.0 | less than 1.0 |
| Michigan          | 5.11          | 4.95          | 4.95          |
| Minnesota         |               | 5.80          | - 21.00       |
| Mississippi       | 18.20         | 14.20         | 11.40         |
| Missouri*         |               |               |               |
| Montana*          |               |               |               |
| Nebraska*         |               |               |               |
| Nevada            |               | 13.70         |               |
| New Hampshire     |               | 4.00          | 3.00          |
| New Jersey        | 13.90         |               |               |
| New Mexico        | 30.00         | 30.00         | 30.00         |
| New York (SUNY)** |               |               |               |
| North Carolina    |               | 47.00         | 175.00        |
| North Dakota*     |               |               |               |
| Ohio*             |               |               |               |
| Oklahoma          | 1.26          | 1.26          | 1.26          |
| Oregon            | 6.80          | 5.00          | 9.00          |

TABLE 16—Continued

| State                           | In District | In State | Out of State |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----------|--------------|
| Pennsylvania                    | 15.60       | 15.60    | 14.10        |
| Rhode Island                    |             | 13.90    | 13.70        |
| South Carolina                  | 12.50       | 12.00    | 15.00        |
| South Dakota*                   |             |          |              |
| Tennessee                       |             | 6.00     |              |
| Texas                           | 13.30       | 52.10    | 39.70        |
| Utah*                           |             |          |              |
| Vermont                         | 7.00        | 7.00     | 7.00         |
| Virginia                        |             | -4.50    | 7.80         |
| Washington                      |             | 8.60     | 8.40         |
| West Virginia                   |             | 8.70     | 5.20         |
| Wisconsin                       | 29.00       | 52.00    | 95.00        |
| Wyoming                         |             | 5.00     | 5.00         |
| Puerto Rico**                   |             |          |              |
| Number of<br>increases reported | 16          | 29       | 27           |
| Average increase                | 13.70       | 13.50    | 22.50        |

\* DID NOT PARTICIPATE

\*\* DID NOT REPORT

**TABLE 17**  
**PERCENTAGE CHANGES IN SOURCES OF FINANCIAL AID**  
**SINCE 1985**

| State            | Federal | State   | Private Foundations | Institutional Funds |
|------------------|---------|---------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Alabama          | 141.00  | 4.00    | 1.00                | 28.00               |
| Alaska*          |         |         |                     |                     |
| Arizona**        |         |         |                     |                     |
| Arkansas**       |         |         |                     |                     |
| California**     |         |         |                     |                     |
| Colorado*        |         |         |                     |                     |
| Connecticut      | - 52.00 | - 73.00 |                     |                     |
| Delaware*        |         |         |                     |                     |
| Florida**        |         |         |                     |                     |
| Georgia**        |         |         |                     |                     |
| Hawaii**         |         |         |                     |                     |
| Idaho*           |         |         |                     |                     |
| Illinois         | 12.60   | - 5.10  | 113.50              | 17.10               |
| Indiana          |         | 27.00   |                     | 28.00               |
| Iowa             | 11.00   | - 9.00  | - 9.00              | 13.00               |
| Kansas*          |         |         |                     |                     |
| Kentucky         | 10.28   | 4.91    | 4.04                |                     |
| Louisiana**      |         |         |                     |                     |
| Maine*           |         |         |                     |                     |
| Maryland         | - 16.00 | - 2.00  | - 60.00             | 5.00                |
| Massachusetts**  |         |         |                     |                     |
| Michigan         |         | 1.00    |                     |                     |
| Minnesota        | 21.00   | 21.00   | 33.00               |                     |
| Mississippi**    |         |         |                     |                     |
| Missouri*        |         |         |                     |                     |
| Montana*         |         |         |                     |                     |
| Nebraska*        |         |         |                     |                     |
| Nevada           | - 3.40  | - 2.00  |                     |                     |
| New Hampshire    | 16.00   | 40.00   |                     | 22.00               |
| New Jersey       | - 27.00 | 9.00    |                     | 8.00                |
| New Mexico**     |         |         |                     |                     |
| New York (SUNY)  | 7.00    | 12.00   |                     |                     |
| North Carolina** |         |         |                     |                     |
| North Dakota*    |         |         |                     |                     |
| Ohio*            |         |         |                     |                     |
| Oklahoma**       |         |         |                     |                     |

TABLE 17—Continued

| State          | Federal | State | Private Foundations | Institutional Funds |
|----------------|---------|-------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Oregon**       |         |       |                     |                     |
| Pennsylvania** |         |       |                     |                     |
| Rhode Island   | 5.70    | 6.50  |                     |                     |
| South Carolina | 0.16    |       |                     | 6.18                |
| South Dakota*  |         |       |                     |                     |
| Tennessee**    |         |       |                     |                     |
| Texas**        |         |       |                     |                     |
| Utah*          |         |       |                     |                     |
| Vermont        |         | 15.00 | 2.00                |                     |
| Virginia       | 9.60    |       |                     |                     |
| Washington**   |         |       |                     |                     |
| West Virginia  | 20.00   |       |                     | 20.00               |
| Wisconsin      | 5.70    |       |                     | 1.70                |
| Wyoming**      |         |       |                     |                     |
| Puerto Rico    | 0.89    | 3.30  |                     | 16.00               |
| Average        | 8.43    | 17.04 | 12.08               | 15.00               |

\* DID NOT PARTICIPATE

\*\* DID NOT REPORT

**TABLE 18**  
**CRITICAL PROBLEMS REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS**

| State             | Reported Problems   |
|-------------------|---|
| Alabama           | Insufficient funding to match annual expenditure levels   |
| Alaska*           |   |
| Arizona**         |   |
| Arkansas          | Total support is inadequate; faculty salaries   |
| California        | Construction spending limits; deferred maintenance; capital outlay program; overall funding level |
| Colorado*         |   |
| Connecticut       | Decrease in federal dollars; budgetary restraints   |
| Delaware*         |   |
| Florida           | Health costs; equipment replacement; faculty salaries   |
| Georgia**         |   |
| Hawaii**          |   |
| Idaho*            |   |
| Illinois**        |   |
| Indiana**         |   |
| Iowa**            |   |
| Kansas*           |   |
| Kentucky          | Significant growth and chronic underfunding   |
| Louisiana**       |   |
| Maine*            |   |
| Maryland          | System is underfunded; must seek additional sources of revenue                                    |
| Massachusetts**   |   |
| Michigan          | Multiple problems including salaries; capital outlay; the nature of the formula                   |
| Minnesota**       |   |
| Mississippi**     |   |
| Missouri*         |   |
| Montana*          |   |
| Nebraska*         |   |
| Nevada            | Full-time/part-time student/faculty ratios; part-time faculty salaries; support services          |
| New Hampshire     | Economic downturn restricts state income—new sources needed                                       |
| New Jersey        | Limited state resources resulting in declining funding  |
| New Mexico        | Overall level of support; state/local cost-sharing  |
| New York (SUNY)** |   |

TABLE 18—Continued

| State          | Reported Problems  |
|----------------|--|
| North Carolina | Inadequate funds to increase average instructor salaries                                     |
| North Dakota*  |  |
| Ohio*          |  |
| Oklahoma**     |  |
| Oregon**       |  |
| Pennsylvania** | State formula funding at less than 100%  |
| Rhode Island** |  |
| South Carolina |  |
| South Dakota*  |  |
| Tennessee      |  |
| Texas**        | Insufficiency of the sales tax base  |
| Utah*          |  |
| Vermont**      |  |
| Virginia**     |  |
| Washington     |  |
| West Virginia  | Faculty salaries; instructional support; equipment;<br>minority student programs; child care |
| Wisconsin      | Governance; funding; assessment and articulation<br>w/voc-tech schools                       |
| Wyoming**      | Property tax millage rate limits property tax growth   |
| Puerto Rico**  |  |

\* DID NOT PARTICIPATE

\*\* DID NOT REPORT

## REFERENCES

- Arney, L.H. *State Patterns of Financial Support for Community Colleges*. Gainesville, Fla.: Institute of Higher Education, 1970.
- Gleazer, E.J. *The Community College: Values, Vision, and Vitality*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1980.
- Leslie, L.L. and Brinkman, P.T. *The Economic Value of Higher Education*. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan, 1988.
- Martorana, S.V. and Wattenbarger, J.L. *Principles, Practices, and Alternatives in State Methods of Financing Community Colleges and an Approach to Their Evaluation, with Pennsylvania a State Case*. Report No. 32. University Park, Penn.: Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Pennsylvania, April 1978.
- Vaughan, G.B. "Balancing Open Access and Quality: The Community College at the Watershed." *Change*, 1984, 16 (2), 38-44.
- Yanikoski, R. "Tuition and Fees: Pricing Strategies." In M. McKeon and K. Alexander (Eds.), *Values in Conflict: Funding Priorities for Higher Education. The Seventh Yearbook of the American Education Finance Association*. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Company, 1986.

## PREVIOUS REPORTS IN THE SERIES

- Wattenbarger, J.L. & Starnes, P.M. *State Funding Formulae for Public Two-Year Colleges*. Gainesville, Fla.: Institute of Higher Education, October 1973.
- Wattenbarger, J.L. & Starnes, P.M. *Financial Support for Community Colleges*. Gainesville, Fla.: Institute of Higher Education, June 1974.
- Wattenbarger, J.L. & Starnes, P.M. *Financial Support Patterns for Community Colleges*. Gainesville, Fla.: Institute of Higher Education, September 1976.
- Wattenbarger, J.L. & Stepp, W.F. *Financing Community Colleges*. Gainesville, Fla.: Institute of Higher Education, August 1979.
- Wattenbarger, J.L. & Bibby, P.J. *Financing Community Colleges*. Gainesville, Fla.: Institute of Higher Education, August 1981.
- Wattenbarger, J.L. & Heck, J. *Financing Community Colleges*. Gainesville, Fla.: Institute of Higher Education, 1983.
- Wattenbarger, J.L. & Mercer, S.L. *Financing Community Colleges*. Gainesville, Fla.: Institute of Higher Education, 1985.
- Wattenbarger, J.L. & Mercer, S.L. *Financing Community Colleges*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1988.

---

*Copies of these publications and several other monographs on a variety of topics are available through the institute. Please write to James L. Wattenbarger, director, Institute of Higher Education, College of Education, Norman Hall, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611.*

*Copies of the 1988 edition of Financing Community Colleges are available for \$3 from AACJC Publications, 2700 Prosperity Ave., Fairfax, VA 22031.*

# APPENDIX A

## THE QUESTIONNAIRE

RETURN TO: James L. Wattenbarger, Director  
Institute of Higher Education  
College of Education  
University of Florida  
Gainesville, Florida 32611

### COMMUNITY COLLEGE FINANCIAL SURVEY—FISCAL YEAR 1988

Institute of Higher Education  
The University of Florida  
Gainesville, Florida 32611

In Cooperation with the National Council of State Directors of  
Community/Junior Colleges

Name of State: \_\_\_\_\_

Person Completing Survey: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone No.: (     ) \_\_\_\_\_

#### I. General Finances

- a. Have there been any major changes in any of the methods of financial support for community colleges in your state since fiscal year 1986?

| Changes State Support:                   | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
| General purpose grants/appropriations    |     |    |
| Restricted purpose grants/appropriations |     |    |
| Funding formulae                         |     |    |

Local Support:  
Tax rates  
Tuition & fees

Other (Please specify)

b. What are the sources of your state appropriations funding?

Sales tax  
Income tax  
Property tax  
Excise taxes  
Lottery revenue  
Other (Please specify)

c. What are the sources of your local tax revenue?

Yes No

None  
Property tax  
Excise tax  
Other (Please specify)

d. Please enclose an explanation of how funds are currently being allocated to institutions as well as a brief description of how the total state appropriation is determined by the legislature. (Please include a copy of any prepared materials.)

e. If funds to individual colleges are apportioned by procedures of the state agency (as different from state law), please enclose an explanation.

II. For the 1987-1988 Academic Year:

a. What is the average expenditure, in terms of operating costs, reported per student? (This should include total E + G expenditures for all students in credit programs.)

FTE Expenditure \$ \_\_\_\_\_

b. What is the total number of students on which above expenditure is based:

Unduplicated headcount \_\_\_\_\_  
Full-time \_\_\_\_\_ Part-time \_\_\_\_\_ FTE \_\_\_\_\_

c. What is the source breakdown by approximate percentage of current general operating funds for community colleges?

|                        |         |
|------------------------|---------|
| Federal                | _____ % |
| State                  | _____ % |
| Local                  | _____ % |
| Student tuition ~ fees | _____ % |
| Other (Please specify) | _____ % |

Total amount of funds \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Each state defines FTE in a somewhat different way. Use your own definition.

### III. Student Tuition & Fees

- a. What has been the percentage increase/decrease in total student tuition and fees since fiscal year 1986? (Do not include boarding or residence fees.)

In-district students:  $\frac{\text{FY 1988}}{\text{FY 1986}} =$  % increase OR % decrease

In-state students:  $\frac{\text{FY 1988}}{\text{FY 1986}} =$  % increase OR % decrease

Out-of-state students:  $\frac{\text{FY 1988}}{\text{FY 1986}} =$  % increase OR % decrease

### IV. Non-Credit Courses:

[if available]

| Percent<br>State<br>Support | Percent<br>Local<br>Support | Percent<br>Student<br>Support | Percent<br>Total |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|

How are courses funded?

|   |       |       |       |        |
|---|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| 1. Non-credit certificate areas (Programs that award certificate of completion) | _____ | _____ | _____ | 100.00 |
| 2. Non-credit community life-long learning (individual courses)                 | _____ | _____ | _____ | 100.00 |
| 3. Recreation/leisure   | _____ | _____ | _____ | 100.00 |
| 4. Training courses (required by law, ie. driver training)                      | _____ | _____ | _____ | 100.00 |

- V. Are program costs analyzed and used in allocating funds to each institution? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  
(Please attach a description of how this is applied to your particular system.)

- VI. Of total state funds, what percent are categorical or of limited use? (Funds appropriated or set aside for specific use only)

- a. \_\_\_\_\_ % categorical or limited use.  
b. What areas are largely categorical supported?
- VII. Does your state have any mandated activities (i.e., restricted class size for some Courses or Assessment tests in order to enter an upper-division [junior- or senior-level] course)?  
a. \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  
b. If Yes: State provides categorical funds to support these mandated activities. \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  
State provides categorical support for what percentage of total activities? \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Please describe these mandated activities.
- VIII. Has your state developed, or is it in the process of developing, support on bases other than FTE enrollment or other student enrollment-driven formulae? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  
If yes, please *attach* a description.
- IX. Please indicate a percentage change in funds available to community colleges for student financial aid since fiscal year 1986. (1988/1986 approximations will be satisfactory.)  
\_\_\_\_\_ % Change in federal funds  
\_\_\_\_\_ % Change in institutional funds  
\_\_\_\_\_ % Change in state funds  
\_\_\_\_\_ % Change in private foundation funds
- X. What are the current critical problem areas in financing community colleges in your state? (Attach any prepared materials.)
- XI. Sources of funds for capital outlay in FY 1988 were:  
Local taxes/bonds \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
State taxes/bonds \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
Other (Please specify) \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
Total amount of funds authorized in FY 1988. \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- XII. What were the total amounts of state appropriations for support of education for the 1988-89 year?  
Public schools (grades K-12) \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
Vocational schools \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
Community colleges \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
Other higher education \$ \_\_\_\_\_

# APPENDIX B

## STATE-LEVEL RESPONDENTS

| State           | Contact            | Phone #        |
|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|
| Alabama         | Brenda Kelley      | (205) 244-7900 |
| Alaska          | —                  |                |
| Arizona         | Thomas Saad        | (602) 255-4037 |
| Arkansas        | Tom Spencer        | (501) 371-1441 |
|                 | Barbara Anderson   |                |
| California      | Jose R. Michel     | (916) 445-1163 |
| Colorado        | —                  |                |
| Connecticut     | Alessandra Tutino  | (203) 556-8760 |
| Delaware        | —                  |                |
| Florida         | Lee P. Young       | (904) 488-7926 |
| Georgia         | Roger Mosshart     | (404) 656-2233 |
| Hawaii          | —                  |                |
| Idaho           | —                  |                |
| Illinois        | Robert Widmer      | (217) 785-0087 |
| Indiana         | Robert W. Ruble    | (317) 232-1900 |
| Iowa            | Charles Moench     | (515) 281-3599 |
| Kansas          | —                  |                |
| Kentucky        | Jack Jordan        | (606) 257-4752 |
| Louisiana       | Michael Galloway   | (504) 342-4253 |
| Maine           | —                  |                |
| Maryland        | Mary Bode          | (301) 974-2881 |
| Massachusetts   | Mary Spolidoro     | (617) 727-7785 |
| Michigan        | Jim Folkening      | (517) 373-3360 |
| Minnesota       | Douglas Easterling | (612) 297-9684 |
| Mississippi     | G. V. Moody        | (601) 982-6518 |
| Missouri        | —                  |                |
| Montana         | —                  |                |
| Nebraska        | —                  |                |
| Nevada          | Ron Sparks         | (704) 784-4036 |
| New Hampshire   | David Milliken     | (603) 271-2721 |
| New Jersey      | Narcisa Polonio    | (609) 984-2676 |
| New Mexico      | Danny Earp         | (505) 827-8300 |
| New York (SUNY) | David Van Nortwick | (518) 443-5129 |
| North Carolina  | Larry Morgan       | (919) 733-7051 |
| North Dakota    | —                  |                |
| Ohio            | —                  |                |
| Oklahoma        | Martha Nagle       | (405) 521-2444 |

| State          | Contact            | Phone #        |
|----------------|--------------------|----------------|
| Oregon         | Debbie Lincoln     | (503) 378-8630 |
| Pennsylvania   | Edward Kloc        | (717) 787-5993 |
| Rhode Island   | Ruth Barrington    | (401) 825-2184 |
| South Carolina | Tim O'Dell         | (803) 737-9411 |
| South Dakota*  | Michel Hillman     | (605) 773-3455 |
| Tennessee      | William Aiken      | (615) 366-4444 |
| Texas          | Bill Webb          | (512) 462-6460 |
| Utah           | —                  |                |
| Vermont        | Claire Daniels     | (802) 241-3535 |
| Virginia       | Joe Hester         | (804) 225-2313 |
| Washington     | Scott Morgan       | (206) 753-0880 |
| West Virginia  | James J. Schneider | (304) 348-0278 |
| Wisconsin      | Gregory Waagner    | (608) 266-2947 |
| Wyoming        | Helen Kitchens     |                |
| Puerto Rico    | Jaime Garcia       | (809) 758-3056 |

\*Does not have a community college system



**American Association of Community and Junior Colleges**

National Center for Higher Education

One Dupont Circle N.W., Suite 410, Washington, D.C. 20036

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

**David S. Honeyman** is currently an associate professor and co-director of the Center for Educational Finance, University of Florida. Honeyman earned his Ph.D. in education administration and finance from the University of Virginia in 1983. He has published in the areas of educational finance and school facilities planning in recognized refereed journals, including *Journal of Education Finance* and *School Business Affairs*. He is an editor of *American Middle School Education*.

**James L. Wattenbarger** is currently a distinguished service professor and director of the Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida. Wattenbarger earned his Ed.D. from the University of Florida in 1950. He initiated studies that led to the development of the state of Florida's currently existing community college system. He serves on the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, which is affiliated with AACJC. Wattenbarger has also published widely in refereed journals, monographs, and books on the American community college.

**Mary Lynn Williamson** is currently a doctoral candidate in educational leadership, College of Education, University of Florida. She earned a Masters in Education in counseling and guidance and an M.A. in student personnel services from Northwestern State University. She served as assistant dean for student services at the University of Florida for five years. Williamson has published monographs and refereed articles on student personnel issues and on the financing of community colleges, and she has made national presentations on student personnel services and student leadership.

ERIC Clearinghouse for  
Junior Colleges

59